

LAW OFFICES  
**HARTMAN & WINNICKI, P.C.**

Dariusz M. Winnicki \*<sup>o</sup>  
Richard L. Ravin \*<sup>o</sup>□  
Daniel L. Schmutter\*  
Andrew T. Wolfe\*

74 PASSAIC STREET  
RIDGEWOOD, NEW JERSEY 07450

Phone: (201) 967-8040  
Fax: (201) 967-0590

\* \* \*

\* New York and New Jersey Bars  
° Florida Bar  
□ Washington, D.C. Bar  
◇ New Jersey Bar

WEBSITE  
[www.hartmanwinnicki.com](http://www.hartmanwinnicki.com)

Porter E. Hartman (1920-2009)  
Charles R. Buhrman (1938-1994)  
William T. Marsden (1943-1993)  
Cyrus D. Samuelson (1911-1998)

December 29, 2022

**VIA ECF**

The Honorable Peter G. Sheridan  
U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey  
Clarkson S. Fisher Building & U.S. Courthouse  
402 East State Street  
Room 2020  
Trenton, NJ 08608

**Re: Association of New Jersey Rifle & Pistol Clubs, Inc., et al. v. Matthew  
Platkin, et al.  
Civil Action No.: 18-cv-10507**

Dear Judge Sheridan:

We represent Plaintiffs in the above referenced matter.

There is currently due on January 4, 2023, Plaintiff's response to the State Defendants' proposed schedule for proceeding forward in this matter. The State Defendants' have proposed substantial fact and expert discovery, culminating in dispositive motions approximately one year from now, and in doing so have offered the declaration of a proposed expert witness.

As the Court is aware, Plaintiffs strongly disagree with that approach and contend that substantially less is appropriate and necessary. This is the reason the Court originally directed the parties to set forth their positions in writing for the Court to consider.

However, since the Court first directed the parties to do so, a major complicating factor has arisen. The State Defendants have also moved to consolidate this four-year-old matter with two other new matters filed *this year* challenging an entirely a different statute. That motion is returnable on January 17, 2023, and Plaintiffs' opposition is due January 3, 2023.

If the Court decides to grant the motion to consolidate, the schedule in this matter is likely to be very different, and the positions of the parties and the arguments in favor of those positions will likely be very different. Therefore, Plaintiffs contend that setting forth their position on scheduling is not really meaningful without knowing what the Court is going to do on the consolidation motion.

The Honorable Peter G. Sheridan

December 29, 2022

Page 2

Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court adjourn the due date for Plaintiffs' position on scheduling until after the Court has decided the pending consolidation motion.

All counsel have consented to this request. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Daniel L. Schmutter  
DANIEL L. SCHMUTTER

DLS/ars

cc: Daniel M. Vannella Esq.  
Kathleen N. Fennelly, Esq.